

**REMARKS**

In a Final Office Action mailed on August 14, 2007, the United States Patent and Trademark Office rejected Claims 48-58 and objected to Claims 68-73 of the present application. The Applicant is cancelling Claim 48 and amending Claims 49-50, 53, 58, 68, and 70-71. For the following reasons, the Applicant believes the now-pending claims (49-58 and 68-73) are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that they be passed to issue.

**Rejection of Claim 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

In the Final Office Action in paragraphs 1-2, Claim 71 is rejected because there is "insufficient antecedent basis" for the claim limitation, "the first cylindrical tube." Claim 71 mistakenly depended on Claim 69, from which there is no antecedent basis for the claim limitation "the first cylindrical tube." Applicant is amending Claim 71 to depend on Claim 70, which does provide antecedent basis for the claim limitation, "the first cylindrical tube." The Applicant is also amending Claim 70 such that the first instance of "the first cylindrical tube" and "the second cylindrical tube" to "a first cylindrical tube" and "a second cylindrical tube," respectively. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes the rejection of Claim 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

**Objection to Claims 68-73**

The Final Office Action, in paragraph 8, states that "Claims 68-73 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim." The Final Office Action further states that Claims 68-73 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Claim 68 previously depended directly on Claim 48. Applicant is amending claim 68 to be an independent claim and to include all the limitations of independent Claim 48. Claims 69-73 all depend on Claim 68. Therefore, Applicant believes the objection to Claims 68-73 has been overcome and respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Rejection of Claims 48-51 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuehnle (WO 98/20241) and Rejection of Claims 56-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kuehnle (WO 98/20241) and Rejection of Claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kuehnle (WO 98/20241) in view of Russell (WO 02/079625)

In paragraphs 4-7 of the Final Office Action, Claims 48-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuehnle (WO 98/20241), 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kuehnle, or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kuehnle in view of Russell (WO 02/079625). Applicant is cancelling Claim 48 and amending Claims 49-58 to depend on Claim 68. Since independent Claim 68 includes limitations that make it allowable over the cited Kuehnle and Russell references and Claims 49-58 now depend on independent Claim 68, these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are moot.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

David J. Thibodeau, Jr.

Registration No. 31,671

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 10/15/07